

4

EXPLOITING SOFTWARE DIVERSIFICATION FOR WEBASSEMBLY

IN this chapter, we illustrate the application of Software Diversification for both offensive and defensive purposes. We discuss two selected use cases that demonstrate our technical contributions to Software Diversification, as presented in Chapter 3. These cases exemplify applications of Software Diversification for WebAssembly in both browser and standalone engines.

4.1 Offensive Diversification: Malware evasion

The primary malicious use of WebAssembly in browsers is cryptojacking [?]. This is due to the essence of cryptojacking, the faster the mining, the better. Although the research of Lehmann and colleagues [?] suggests a decline in browser-based cryptominers, mainly due to the shutdown of Coinhive, a 2022 report by Kaspersky indicates that the use of cryptominers is on the rise [?]. This underscores the ongoing need for effective automatic detection of cryptojacking malware.

Let us illustrate how a malicious Wasm binary could be involved into browser cryptojacking. Figure 4.1 illustrates a browser attack scenario: a practical WebAssembly cryptojacking attack consists of three components: a WebAssembly binary, a JavaScript wrapper, and a backend cryptominer pool. The WebAssembly binary is responsible for executing the hash calculations, which consume significant computational resources. The JavaScript wrapper facilitates the communication between the WebAssembly binary and the cryptominer pool.

For the previous triad to work, the following steps are executed. First, the victim visits a web page infected with the cryptojacking code. The web page

⁰Comp. time 2023/10/18 09:03:37




Figure 4.1: A remote mining pool server, a JavaScript wrapper and the WebAssembly binary form the triad of a cryptojacking attack in browser clients.

establishes a channel to the cryptominer pool, which then assigns a hashing job to the infected browser. The WebAssembly cryptominer calculates thousands of hashes inside the browser. Once the malware server receives acceptable hashes, it is rewarded with cryptocurrencies for the mining. Then, the server assigns a new job, and the mining process starts over.

Both antivirus software and browsers have implemented measures to detect cryptojacking. For instance, Firefox employs deny lists to detect cryptomining activities [?]. The academic community has also contributed to the body of work on detecting or preventing WebAssembly-based cryptojacking, as outlined in Section 2.1.5. However, malicious actors can employ evasion techniques to circumvent these detection mechanisms. Bhansali et al. are among the first who have investigated how WebAssembly cryptojacking could potentially evade detection [?], highlighting the critical importance of this use case. For an in-depth discussion on this topic, we direct the reader to our contribution [?]. The use of case illustrated in the subsequent sections uses Offensive Software Diversification for the sake of evading malware detection in WebAssembly.

4.1.1 Cryptojacking defense evasion

Considering the previous scenario, several techniques, as outlined in Section 2.1.5, can be directly implemented in browsers to thwart cryptojacking by identifying the malicious WebAssembly components. Such defense scenario is illustrated in Figure 4.2, where the WebAssembly malicious binary is blocked in ③. The primary aim of our use of case is to investigate the effectiveness of code diversification as a means to circumvent cryptojacking defenses. Specifically, we assess whether the following evasion workflow can successfully bypass existing security measures:




Figure 4.2: Cryptojacking scenario in which the malware detection mechanism is bypassed by using an evasion technique.

1. The user lands on a webpage infected with cryptojacking malware, which leverages network resources for execution—corresponding to (1) and (2) in Figure 4.2.
2. A malware detection mechanism(malware oracle) identifies and blocks malicious WebAssembly binaries at (3). For example, a network proxy could intercept and forward these resources to an external detection service via its API.
3. Anticipating that a specific malware detection system is consistently used for defense, the attacker swiftly generates a variant of the WebAssembly cryptojacking malware designed to evade detection at (4).
4. The attacker delivers the modified binary instead of the original one (5), which initiates the cryptojacking process and compromises the browser (6). The detection method is completely oblivious to the malicious nature of the binary, and the attack is successful.

4.1.2 Methodology

In this study, we categorize malware detection mechanisms as malware oracles, which can be of two types: binary and numeric. A binary oracle provides a binary decision, labeling a WebAssembly binary as either malicious or benign. In contrast, a numeric oracle returns a numerical value representing the confidence level of the detection.

Definition 3. *Malware oracle* A malware oracle is a detection mechanism that returns either a binary decision or a numerical value indicating the confidence level of the detection.

For empirical validation, we employ VirusTotal as a numeric oracle and MINOS [?] as a binary oracle. VirusTotal is an online service that analyzes files and returns a confidence score in the form of the number of antivirus that flag the input file as malware, thus qualifying as a numeric oracle. MINOS, on the other hand, converts WebAssembly binaries into grayscale images and employs a convolutional neural network for classification. It returns a binary decision, making it a binary oracle.

We use the wasmbench dataset [?] to establish a ground truth. After running the wasmbench dataset through VirusTotal and MINOS, we identify 33 binaries flagged as malicious by at least one VirusTotal vendor and also detected by MINOS. Then, to simulate the evasion scenario, we use WASM-MUTATE to generate WebAssembly binary variants to evade malware detection. We use WASM-MUTATE in two configurations: controlled and uncontrolled diversification.

Definition 4. *Controlled Diversification:* In controlled diversification, the transformation process of a WebAssembly program is guided by a numeric oracle, which influences the probability of each transformation. For instance, WASM-MUTATE can be configured to apply transformations that minimize the oracle’s confidence score. Note that controlled diversification needs a numeric oracle.

Definition 5. *Uncontrolled Diversification:* Unlike controlled diversification, uncontrolled diversification is a stochastic process where each transformation has an equal likelihood of being applied to the input WebAssembly binary.

Based on the two types of malware oracles and diversification configurations, we examine three scenarios: 1) VirusTotal with a controlled diversification, 2) VirusTotal with an uncontrolled diversification, and 3) MINOS with an uncontrolled diversification. Notice that, the fourth scenario with MINOS and a controlled diversification is not feasible, as MINOS is a binary oracle and cannot provide the numerical values required for controlled diversification.

Our evaluation focuses on two key metrics: the success rate of evading detection mechanisms in VirusTotal and MINOS across the 33 flagged binaries, and the performance impact on the variants that successfully evade detection. The first metric measures the efficacy of WASM-MUTATE in bypassing malware detection systems. For each flagged binary, we input it into WASM-MUTATE, configured with the selected oracle and diversification strategy. We then iteratively apply transformations to the output from the preceding step. This iterative process is halted either when the binary is no longer flagged by the oracle or when a maximum of 1000 stacked transformations have been applied (see Definition 2). This process is repeated with 10 random seeds per binary to simulate 10 different evasion experiments per binary. The second metric is crucial for validating the real-world applicability of WASM-MUTATE in evading malware detection. Specifically, if the evasion process significantly degrades the performance of the resulting binary compared to its original version, it becomes

less likely to be employed in practical scenarios, such as cryptojacking. For this, we execute, end-to-end, the variants that fully evade VirusTotal when generated with WASM-MUTATE in controlled and uncontrolled diversification configurations for which we could completely reproduce the three components in Figure 4.1.

4.1.3 Results

In Table 4.1, we present a comprehensive summary of the evasion experiments presented in [?], focusing on two oracles: VirusTotal and MINOS[?]. The table is organized into two main categories to separate the results for each malware oracle. For VirusTotal, we further subdivide the results based on the two diversification configurations we employ: uncontrolled and controlled diversification. In these subsections, we provide columns that indicate the number of VirusTotal vendors that flag the original binary as malware (#D), the maximum number of successfully evaded detectors (Max. #evaded), and the average number of transformations required (Mean #trans.) for each sample. We highlight in bold text the values for which the uncontrolled diversification or controlled diversification setups are better than each other, the lower, the better. The MINOS section simply includes a column that specifies the number of transformations needed for complete evasion. The table has $33 + 1$ rows, each representing a unique Wasm malware study subject. The final row offers the median number of transformations required for evasion across our evaluated setups and oracles.

Uncontrolled diversification to evade VirusTotal: We run uncontrolled diversification with WASM-MUTATE with a limit of 1000 iterations per binary. At each iteration, we query VirusTotal to check if the new binary evades the detection. This process is repeated with 10 random seeds per binary to simulate 10 different evasion experiments per binary. As shown in the uncontrolled diversification part of Table 4.1, we successfully generate variants that evade detection for 30 out of 33 binaries. The mean value of iterations needed to generate a variant that evades all detectors ranges from 120 to 635 stacked transformations. The mean number of iterations needed is always less than 1000 stacked transformations. There are 3 binaries for which the uncontrolled diversification setup does not completely evade the detection. In these three cases, the algorithm misses 5 out 31, 6 out of 30 and 5 out 26 detectors. The explanation is the maximum number of iterations 1000 we use for our experiments. However, having more iterations seems not a realistic scenario. For example, if some transformations increment the binary size during the transformation, a considerably large binary might be impractical for bandwidth reasons. Overall, uncontrolled diversification with WASM-MUTATE clearly decreases the detection rate by VirusTotal antivirus vendors for cryptojacking malware, achieving total

| Hash | #D | VirusTotal | | | | MINOS[?] | |
|----------|----|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|-----------|--|
| | | Uncontrolled diversification | | Controlled diversification | | | |
| | | Max. evaded | Mean trans. | Max. evaded | Mean trans. | | |
| 47d29959 | 31 | 26 | N/A | 19 | N/A | 100 | |
| 9d30e7f0 | 30 | 24 | N/A | 17 | N/A | 419 | |
| 8ebf4e44 | 26 | 21 | N/A | 13 | N/A | 92 | |
| c11d82d | 20 | 20 | 355 | 20 | 446 | 115 | |
| 0d996462 | 19 | 19 | 401 | 19 | 697 | 24 | |
| a32a6f4b | 18 | 18 | 635 | 18 | 625 | 1 | |
| fbdd1efa | 18 | 18 | 310 | 18 | 726 | 1 | |
| d2141ff2 | 9 | 9 | 461 | 9 | 781 | 81 | |
| aafff587 | 6 | 6 | 484 | 6 | 331 | 1 | |
| 046dc081 | 6 | 6 | 404 | 6 | 159 | 33 | |
| 643116ff | 6 | 6 | 144 | 6 | 436 | 47 | |
| 15b86a25 | 4 | 4 | 253 | 4 | 131 | 1 | |
| 006b2fb6 | 4 | 4 | 282 | 4 | 380 | 1 | |
| 942be4f7 | 4 | 4 | 200 | 4 | 200 | 29 | |
| 7c36f462 | 4 | 4 | 236 | 4 | 221 | 85 | |
| fb15929f | 4 | 4 | 297 | 4 | 475 | 1 | |
| 24aae13a | 4 | 4 | 252 | 4 | 401 | 980 | |
| 000415b2 | 3 | 3 | 302 | 3 | 34 | 960 | |
| 4cdbbbb1 | 3 | 3 | 295 | 3 | 72 | 1 | |
| 65debcbe | 2 | 2 | 131 | 2 | 33 | 38 | |
| 59955b4c | 2 | 2 | 130 | 2 | 33 | 38 | |
| 89a3645c | 2 | 2 | 431 | 2 | 107 | 108 | |
| a74a7cb8 | 2 | 2 | 124 | 2 | 33 | 38 | |
| 119c53eb | 2 | 2 | 104 | 2 | 18 | 1 | |
| 089dd312 | 2 | 2 | 153 | 2 | 123 | 68 | |
| c1be4071 | 2 | 2 | 130 | 2 | 33 | 38 | |
| dceaf65b | 2 | 2 | 140 | 2 | 132 | 66 | |
| 6b8c7899 | 2 | 2 | 143 | 2 | 33 | 38 | |
| a27b45ef | 2 | 2 | 145 | 2 | 33 | 33 | |
| 68ca7c0e | 2 | 2 | 137 | 2 | 33 | 38 | |
| f0b24409 | 2 | 2 | 127 | 2 | 11 | 33 | |
| 5bc53343 | 2 | 2 | 118 | 2 | 33 | 33 | |
| e09c32c5 | 1 | 1 | 120 | 1 | 488 | 15 | |
| Median | | | 218 | | 131 | 38 | |

Table 4.1: The table has two main categories for each malware oracle, corresponding to the two oracles we use: VirusTotal and MINOS. For VirusTotal, divide the results based on the two diversification configurations: uncontrolled and controlled diversification. We provide columns that indicate the number of VirusTotal vendors that flag the original binary as malware (#D), the maximum number of successfully evaded detectors (Max. #evaded), and the average number of transformations required (Mean #trans.) for each sample. We highlight in bold text the values for which diversification setups are better than each other, the lower, the better. The MINOS section includes a column that specifies the number of transformations needed for complete evasion. The final row offers the median number of transformations required for evasion across our evaluated setups and oracles.

evasion of WebAssembly cryptojacking malware in 30/33 (90%) of the malware dataset.

Takeaway

When compared with the data in Table 3.1, WASM-MUTATE generates an average of nearly 10000 variants per binary within an hour. Thus, WASM-MUTATE is capable of successfully evading detection systems in just a matter of minutes.

Controlled diversification to evade VirusTotal: Uncontrolled diversification does not guide the diversification based on the number of evaded detectors, it is purely random, and has some drawbacks. For example, some transformations might suppress other transformations previously applied. We have observed that, by carefully selecting the order and type of transformations applied, it is possible to evade detection systems in fewer iterations. This can be appreciated in the results of the controlled diversification part of Table 4.1. Analyzing the data in Table 4.1, we observe that the controlled diversification setup successfully generates variants that totally evade the detection for 30 out of 33 binaries, it thus as good as the uncontrolled setup. The iterations needed for the controlled diversification setup are 92% of the needed on average for the uncontrolled diversification setup. For 21 of 30 binaries that evade detection entirely, we observe that the mean number of oracle calls needed is lower than those in the baseline evasion algorithm. For example, f0b24409 needs 11 oracle calls with controlled diversification setup to fully evade VirusTotal, while for the uncontrolled one, it needs 127 oracles calls. For those 21 binaries, it needs only 40% of the calls the controlled diversification setup needs.

Uncontrolled diversification to evade MINOS: Additionally, relying solely on VirusTotal as the detection mechanism could be problematic, especially when specialized solutions exist exclusively for WebAssembly, unlike the general-purpose vendors in VirusTotal. To address this concern, we also assessed the efficacy of our evasion algorithms against MINOS, a WebAssembly-specific antivirus. We iteratively applied random mutations to the original malware binary until either MINOS was fully evaded or a maximum iteration limit was reached. This process was repeated 10 times for each binary. The outcomes are displayed in the last column of Table 4.1. The last row of Table 4.1 shows that WebAssembly diversification requires fewer iterations to evade MINOS than VirusTotal, meaning that it is easier to evade MINOS. The median number of iterations needed overall for evading VirusTotal is 218 for the uncontrolled diversification setup, and 131 for the controlled diversification setup, while for MINOS is 38. Remarkably, WASM-MUTATE totally evades detection for 8 out of 33 binaries in one single iteration in the case of MINOS. This shows that the MINOS model is fragile wrt binary diversification.

Takeaway

According to our results, VirusTotal can be considered better than MINOS wrt to cryptojacking detection. The main reason is that a wider spectrum of antivirus vendors is used in VirusTotal, while MINOS is a single detector. Therefore, this advocates for the use of multiple malware oracles (meta-oracles) to detect cryptojacking malware in browsers, even in the case Wasm-specific detection mechanism.

Performance To evaluate the real-world efficacy of WASM-MUTATE in evading malware detection, we focused on six binaries that we could build and execute end-to-end, as these had all three components outlined in Figure 4.1. For these binaries, we replace the original WebAssembly code with variants generated using VirusTotal as the malware oracle and WASM-MUTATE for both controlled and uncontrolled diversification configurations. We then execute both the original and the generated variants. We assessed the variants based on the hash generation rate.

We have found that 19% of the generated variants outperformed the original cryptojacking binaries. This improvement is attributed to WASM-MUTATE's ability to introduce code optimizations. Additionally, debloating transformations, which eliminate unnecessary structures and dead code, resulted in a higher hash generation rate during the initial seconds of mining, likely due to faster compilation times. This suggests that focused optimization serves as a valuable tool for evasion in browsers. On the contrary, 80% of the generated variants are less efficient than the original binary, with the least efficient variant operating at only 20% of the original hash generation rate. This performance drop is primarily due to non-optimal transformations introduced by WASM-MUTATE. Variants generated through uncontrolled diversification are generally slower. In summary, controlled diversification yielded variants that evaded VirusTotal detection with minimal performance overhead—the worst-performing variant was only 1.93 times slower than the original.

Contribution paper

Our work provides evidence that the malware detection community has opportunities to strengthen the automatic detection of cryptojacking WebAssembly malware. The results of our work are actionable, as we also provide quantitative evidence on specific malware transformations on which detection methods can focus. The case discussed in this section is fully detailed in Cabrera-Arteaga et al. "WebAssembly Diversification for Malware Evasion" at *Computers & Security*, 2023 <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167404823002067>.

4.2 Defensive Diversification: Speculative Side-channel protection

As discussed in Section 2.1, WebAssembly is quickly becoming a cornerstone technology in backend systems. Leading companies like Cloudflare and Fastly are championing the integration of WebAssembly into their edge computing platforms, thereby enabling developers to deploy applications that are both modular and securely sandboxed. These client-side WebAssembly applications are generally architected as isolated, single-responsibility services, a model referred to as Function-as-a-Service (FaaS) [? ?]. The operational flow of WebAssembly binaries in FaaS platforms is illustrated in Figure 4.3.




Figure 4.3: WebAssembly binaries on FaaS platforms. Developers can submit any WebAssembly binary to the platform to be executed as a service in a sandboxed and isolated manner. Yet, WebAssembly binaries are not immune to Spectre attacks.

The fundamental advantage of using WebAssembly in FaaS platforms lies in its ability to encapsulate thousands of client WebAssembly binaries within a singular host process. A developer could compile its source code into a WebAssembly program suitable for the cloud platform and then submit it (① in Figure 4.3). This host process is then disseminated across a network of servers and data centers (② in Figure 4.3). These platforms convert WebAssembly programs into native code, which is subsequently executed in a sandboxed environment. Host processes can then instantiate new WebAssembly sandboxes for each client function, executing them in response to specific user requests with nanosecond-level latency (③ in Figure 4.3). This architecture inherently isolates WebAssembly binary executions from each other as well as from the host process, enhancing security.

However, while WebAssembly is engineered with a strong focus on security and isolation, it is not entirely immune to vulnerabilities such as Spectre attacks

[? ?] (④ in Figure 4.3). In the sections that follow, we explore how software diversification techniques can be employed to fortify WebAssembly binaries against such attacks. For an in-depth discussion on this topic, we direct the reader to our contribution [?].

4.2.1 Threat model: speculative side-channel attacks

To illustrate the threat model concerning WebAssembly programs in FaaS platforms, consider the following scenarios. Developers, including potentially malicious actors, have the ability to submit any WebAssembly binary to the FaaS platform. A malicious actor could then upload a WebAssembly binary that, once compiled to native code, employs Spectre attacks to either leak sensitive information from the host process or violate Control Flow Integrity (CFI). Furthermore, even if a submitted WebAssembly binary is not intentionally malicious, it may still be vulnerable to Spectre attacks. For instance, a malicious actor could exploit this vulnerability by executing the susceptible binary through the FaaS service.

Spectre attacks exploit hardware-based prediction mechanisms to trigger mispredictions, leading to the speculative execution of specific instruction sequences that are not part of the original, sequential execution flow. By taking advantage of this speculative execution, an attacker can potentially access sensitive information stored in the memory allocated to other WebAssembly instances (including itself) or even the host process itself. This poses a significant risk, compromising both the security and integrity of the overall system.

Narayan and colleagues [?] have categorized potential Spectre attacks on Wasm binaries into three distinct types, each corresponding to a specific hardware predictor being exploited and a particular FaaS scenario: Branch Target Buffer Attacks, Return Stack Buffer Attacks, and Pattern History Table Attacks defined as follows:

1. The Spectre Branch Target Buffer (btb) attack exploits the branch target buffer by predicting the target of an indirect jump, thereby rerouting speculative control flow to an arbitrary target.
2. The Spectre Return Stack Buffer (rsb) attack exploits the return stack buffer that stores the locations of recently executed call instructions to predict the target of `ret` instructions.
3. The Spectre Pattern History Table (pht) takes advantage of the pattern history table to anticipate the direction of a conditional branch during the ongoing evaluation of a condition.

4.2.2 Methodology

Our goal is to empirically validate that Software Diversification can effectively mitigate the risks associated with Spectre attacks in WebAssembly binaries. The green-highlighted section in Figure 4.4 illustrates how Software Diversification can be integrated into the FaaS platform workflow. The core idea is to generate unique and diverse WebAssembly variants that can be randomized at the time of deployment. For this use case, we employ WASM-MUTATE as our tool for Software Diversification.

To empirically demonstrate that Software Diversification can indeed mitigate Spectre vulnerabilities, we reuse the WebAssembly attack scenarios proposed by Narayan and colleagues in their work on Swivel [?]. Swivel is a compiler-based strategy designed to counteract Spectre attacks on WebAssembly binaries by linearizing their control flow during machine code compilation. Our approach differs from theirs in that it is binary-based, compiler-agnostic, and platform-agnostic; we do not propose altering the deployment or toolchain of FaaS platforms. Although our experiments are conducted prior to submitting the WebAssembly binary to the FaaS platform, we argue that WebAssembly binary diversification could be implemented at any stage of the FaaS workflow. The same argument holds by using any other diversification tool presented in this dissertation (see Chapter 3).




Figure 4.4: Diversifying WebAssembly binaries to mitigate Spectre attacks in FaaS platforms.

To measure the efficacy of WASM-MUTATE in mitigating Spectre, we diversify four WebAssembly binaries proposed in the Swivel study. The names of these programs and the specific attacks we examine are available in [?]. For each

| Program | Attack |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| btb_breakout | Spectre branch target buffer (btb) |
| btb_leakage | Spectre branch target buffer(btb) |
| ret2spec | Spectre Return Stack Buffer (rsb) |
| pht | Spectre Pattern History Table (pht) |

Table 4.2: WebAssembly program name and its respective attack.

of these four binaries, we generate up to 1000 random stacked transformations (see Definition 2) using 100 distinct seeds, resulting in a total of 100,000 variants for each original binary. At every 100th stacked transformation for each binary and seed, we assess the impact of diversification on the Spectre attacks by measuring the attack bandwidth for data exfiltration. This metric not only captures the success or failure of the attacks but also quantifies the extent to which data exfiltration is hindered. For example, a variant that still leaks data but does so at an impractically slow rate would be considered hardened against the attack.

Definition 6. *Attack bandwidth:* Given data $D = \{b_0, b_1, \dots, b_C\}$ being exfiltrated in time T and $K = k_1, k_2, \dots, k_N$ the collection of correct data bytes, the bandwidth metric is defined as:

$$\frac{|b_i \text{ such that } b_i \in K|}{T}$$

4.2.3 Results

Figure 4.5 offers a graphical representation of WASM-MUTATE’s influence on the Swivel original programs: btb_breakout and btb_leakage with the btb attack. The Y-axis represents the exfiltration bandwidth (see Definition 6). The bandwidth of the original binary under attack is marked as a blue dashed horizontal line. In each plot, the variants are grouped in clusters of 100 stacked transformations. These are indicated by the green violinplots.

Population Strength: For the binaries btb_breakout and btb_leakage, WASM-MUTATE exhibits a high level of effectiveness, generating variants that leak less information than the original in 78% and 70% of instances, respectively. For both programs, after applying 200 stacked transformations, the exfiltration bandwidth drops to zero. This implies that WASM-MUTATE is capable of synthesizing variants that are entirely protected from the original attack.




Figure 4.5: Impact of WASM-MUTATE over *btb_breakout* and *btb_leakage* binaries. The Y-axis denotes exfiltration bandwidth, with the original binary’s bandwidth under attack highlighted by a blue marker and dashed line. Variants are clustered in groups of 100 stacked transformations, denoted by green violinplots. Overall, for all 100000 variants generated out of each original program, 70% have less data leakage bandwidth. After 200 stacked transformations, the exfiltration bandwidth drops to zero.

Takeaway

As indicated in Table 3.1, generating a variant with 200 stacked transformations can be accomplished in just a matter of minutes. When scaled to the scope of a global FaaS platform, this means that a unique, fortified variant could be deployed for each machine and even for each fresh WebAssembly spawned per user request.




Figure 4.6: Impact of WASM-MUTATE over *ret2spec* and *pht* binaries. The Y-axis denotes exfiltration bandwidth, with the original binary’s bandwidth under attack highlighted by a blue marker and dashed line. Variants are clustered in groups of 100 stacked transformations, denoted by green violinplots. Overall, for both programs approximately 70% of the variants have less data leakage bandwidth.

As illustrated in Figure 4.6, similarly to Figure 4.5, WASM-MUTATE significantly impacts the programs *ret2spec* and *pht* when subjected to their

respective attacks. In 76% of instances for ret2spec and 71% for pht, the generated variants demonstrated reduced attack bandwidth compared to the original binaries. The plots reveal that a notable decrease in exfiltration bandwidth occurs after applying at least 100 stacked transformations. While both programs show signs of hardening through reduced attack bandwidth, this effect is not immediate and requires a substantial number of transformations to become effective. Additionally, the bandwidth distribution is more varied for these two programs compared to the two previous ones. Our analysis suggests a correlation between the reduction in attack bandwidth and the complexity of the binary being diversified. Specifically, ret2spec and pht are substantially larger programs, containing over 300,000 instructions, compared to btb_breakout and btb_leakage, which have fewer than 800 instructions. Therefore, given that WASM-MUTATE performs incremental transformations, the probability of affecting critical components to hinder attacks decreases in larger binaries.

Managed memory impact: The success in diminishing exfiltration is explained by the fact that WASM-MUTATE synthesizes variants that effectively alter memory access patterns. We have identified four primary factors responsible for the divergence in memory accesses among WASM-MUTATE generated variants. First, modifications to the binary layout—even those that don’t affect executed code—inevitably alter memory accesses within the program’s stack. Specifically, WASM-MUTATE generates variants that modify the return addresses of functions, which consequently leads to differences in execution flow and memory accesses. Second, one of our rewriting rules incorporates artificial global values into Wasm binaries. Since these global variables are inherently manipulated via the stack, and given that the stack is located within linear memory, their access inevitably affects the managed memory (see Section 2.1.3). Third, WASM-MUTATE injects ‘phantom’ instructions which don’t aim to modify the outcome of a transformed function during execution. These intermediate calculations trigger the spill/reload component of the wasmtime compiler, varying spill and reload operations. In the context of limited physical resources, these operations temporarily store values in memory for later retrieval and use, thus creating diverse managed memory accesses(see the example at Section 3.3.1). Finally, certain rewriting rules implemented by WASM-MUTATE replicate fragments of code, e.g., performing commutative operations. These code segments may contain memory accesses, and while neither the memory addresses nor their values change, the frequency of these operations does.

Disrupting accurate timers: Cache timing side-channel attacks, including for the four binaries analyzed in this case study, depend on precise timers to measure cache access times. Disrupting these timers can effectively neutralize the attack. For example, in other contexts, Firefox employs a strategy to counter timing attacks by randomizing its built-in JavaScript timer [?]. WASM-

MUTATE inherently adopts a similar approach, introducing perturbations in the timing steps of Wasm variants in case they are malicious. This is illustrated in Listing 4.1 and Listing 4.2, where the former shows the original time measurement and the latter presents a variant with WASM-MUTATE-introduced operations. WASM-MUTATE is particularly effective in disrupting cache access timers. By introducing additional instructions, the inherent randomness in the time measurement of a single or a few instructions is amplified, thereby reducing the timer’s accuracy.

```
;; Code from original btb_breakout
...
(call $readTimer)
(set_local $end_time)
... access to mem
(i64.sub (get_local $end_time) (get_local $start_time))
(set_local $duration)
...
```

Listing 4.1: Wasm timer used in btb_breakout program.

```
;; Variant code
...
(call $readTimer)
(set_local $end_time)
<inserted instructions>
... access to mem
<inserted instructions>
(i64.sub (get_local $end_time) (get_local $start_time))
(set_local $duration)
...
```

Listing 4.2: Variant of btb_breakout with more instructions added in between time measurement.

Padding speculated instructions: Additionally, CPUs have a limit on the number of instructions they can cache. WASM-MUTATE injects instructions to potentially exceed this limit, effectively disabling the speculative execution of memory accesses. This approach is akin to padding [?], as demonstrated in Listing 4.3 and Listing 4.4. This padding disrupts the binary code’s layout in memory, hindering the attacker’s ability to initiate speculative execution. Even if speculative execution occurs, the memory access does not proceed as the attacker intended.

```
;; Code from original btb_breakout
...
;; train the code to jump here (index 1)
(i32.load (i32.const 2000))
(i32.store (i32.const 83)) ; just prevent optimization
...
;; transiently jump here
(i32.load (i32.const 339968)) ; S(83) is the secret
(i32.store (i32.const 83)) ; just prevent optimization
```

Listing 4.3: Two jump locations in `btb_breakout`. The top one trains the branch predictor, the bottom one is the expected jump that exfiltrates the memory access.

```
;; Variant code
...
;; train the code to jump here (index 1)
<inserted instructions>
(i32.load (i32.const 2000))
<inserted instructions>
(i32.store (i32.const 83)) ; just prevent optimization
...
;; transiently jump here
<inserted instructions>
(i32.load (i32.const 339968)) ; "S"(83) is the secret
<inserted instructions>
(i32.store (i32.const 83)) ; just prevent optimization
...
```

Listing 4.4: Variant of `btb_breakout` with more instructions added indindinctly between jump places.

Drawbacks: We observed that the exfiltration bandwidth tends to increase in variants with only a few transformations. This suggests that not all transformations uniformly contribute to reducing data leakage. Several key factors contribute to this phenomenon. First, as emphasized previously in Section 4.1, uncontrolled diversification can be counterproductive if a specific objective, e.g., if a cost function, is not established at the beginning of the diversification process. Second, while some transformations yield distinct Wasm binaries, their compilation produces identical machine code. Transformations that are not preserved(see Section 3.4) undermine the effectiveness of diversification. For example, incorporating random `nop` operations directly into Wasm does not modify the final machine code as the `nop` operations are often removed by the compiler. The same phenomenon is observed with transformations to custom sections of WebAssembly binaries. Additionally, it is important to note that transformed code doesn't always execute, i.e., WASM-MUTATE may generate dead code.

Contribution paper

WASM-MUTATE crafts WebAssembly binaries that are resilient to Spectre-like attacks. By integrating a software diversification layer into WebAssembly binaries deployed on Function-as-a-Service (FaaS) platforms, security can be significantly bolstered. This approach allows for the deployment of unique and diversified WebAssembly binaries, potentially utilizing a distinct variant for each cloud node, thereby enhancing the overall security. The case discussed in this section is fully detailed in Cabrera-Arteaga et al. "WASM-MUTATE: Fast and Effective Binary Diversification for WebAssembly" *Under review* <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2309.07638.pdf>.

■ Conclusions

In this chapter, we discuss two sides of Software Diversification as applied to WebAssembly: Offensive Software Diversification and Defensive Software Diversification. The term *Offensive Software Diversification* may seem counterintuitive at first glance, but its role is to underscore both the capabilities and the latent security risks inherent in applying Software Diversification to WebAssembly. Our research indicates that there are ways for enhancing the automated detection of cryptojacking malware in WebAssembly, e.g. by testing their resilience with WebAssembly malware variants. On the other hand, Defensive Software Diversification acts as a preemptive safeguard, specifically to mitigate the risks posed by Spectre attacks. In the subsequent chapter, we will consolidate the principal conclusions of this dissertation and describe directions for future research.

